

Date: Mon, 10 May 93 15:43:44 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #136
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Mon, 10 May 93 Volume 93 : Issue 136

Today's Topics:

CFV: rec.radio.amateur reorganization
 no-code defense
 Novice/Tech Data privileges on 10m
 sick of it all (2 msgs)
What we all agree on - THEORY TESTS THAT MEAN SOMETHING

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 10 May 1993 11:45:16 -0400
From: bounce-back@uunet.uu.net
Subject: CFV: rec.radio.amateur reorganization
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

CALL FOR VOTES
REC.RADIO.AMATEUR REORGANIZATION

This is an official Call for Votes for the reorganization of the
rec.radio.amateur hierarchy of newsgroups. This vote will be conducted
according to the official newsgroup creation procedures, which are posted
regularly in news.groups.

Votes may be cast only with the simple fill-in-the-blanks form which appears
in the "HOW TO CAST YOUR VOTE" section later in this CFV.

SUBJECT OF VOTE

All of the newsgroups proposed below are UNMODERATED.

rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

amateur packet radio, RTTY, AMTOR, Clover and other digital amateur radio modes (This replaces rec.radio.amateur.packet and adds other digital modes to the subject)

rec.radio.amateur.digital.tcp-ip

TCP/IP via amateur packet radio

rec.radio.amateur.dx

DX (long distance) amateur radio communications

rec.radio.amateur.antenna

amateur radio antennas: theory, techniques and construction

rec.radio.amateur.equipment

amateur radio equipment: manufactured products and modifications

rec.radio.amateur.instruction

amateur radio instruction & examination

rec.radio.amateur.operating

amateur radio operating procedures and techniques

rec.radio.amateur.homebrew

amateur radio construction & experimentation

rec.radio.amateur.space

amateur radio in space: amateur radio satellites, earth-moon-earth (EME) communications, space shuttle, MIR space station, etc.

rec.radio.amateur.emerg-services

emergency services: RACES, ARES, NTS, and other use of amateur radio in emergencies or disasters

rec.radio.amateur.rdf

radio direction finding: recreational hunts and searches for interference

Two existing newsgroups will not be affected by this vote. They are rec.radio.amateur.misc and rec.radio.amateur.policy. They do not appear on the voting form and no changes resulting from this procedure will apply to them. rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc will replace rec.radio.amateur.packet if it passes, otherwise rec.radio.amateur.packet will remain unchanged.

DURATION OF VOTE

Voting will commence when this CFV is posted. It will continue until 9 June 1993 at 23:59PM UTC.

Voting procedures are detailed in the next section, "HOW TO CAST YOUR VOTE."

Upon completion of the voting period, the results will be posted to news.announce.newgroups, news.groups, rec.radio.info and all the current rec.radio.amateur.* newsgroups. In order to pass, newsgroups must have at least a 2/3 majority of YES votes and at least 100 more YES than NO votes.

HOW TO CAST YOUR VOTE

Jay Maynard, K5ZC, is serving as vote-taker for this vote. Please REPLY to this message via MAIL to his account, jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu; using your newsreader's "mail a reply" command on this message should work. Posted votes can not be counted. You will receive a reply within a few days after your votes are received which indicates how the vote counting software thinks you voted - please mail corrections immediately.

PLEASE USE THE FORM AS IT IS.

Please do not delete anything between the "--==--==" lines - and most certainly do not monkey with the group names. Votes will be tallied by an automatic program and if it can't determine your vote you will be asked to re-vote.

For each group that you wish to vote on, simply add your vote in the appropriate space on the same line. Recognized votes are Yes, No, For, and Against. Yes and For are equivalent, as are No and Against. Capitalization is not important. If you want to abstain from voting on a particular group, just leave the space blank. Don't worry about spacing of the columns or any quote characters ">" that your reply inserts.

You may NOT do a combined vote - i.e., "I vote for all of them" or "I vote against all of them." Please use the form.

You may only vote once, regardless of how many accounts you may have. Forwarded or proxy votes are invalid.

--==--==-- Don't Delete Anything Between These Lines ==--==--==--

rec.radio.amateur reorganization Ballot [RRAR0001]

Your Vote Group

```
yes      this.is.an.example.group
>no      this.is.another.example.group
          this.is.an.example.abstention

          rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc
          rec.radio.amateur.digital.tcp-ip
          rec.radio.amateur.dx
          rec.radio.amateur.antenna
          rec.radio.amateur.equipment
          rec.radio.amateur.instruction
          rec.radio.amateur.operating
          rec.radio.amateur.homebrew
          rec.radio.amateur.space
          rec.radio.amateur.emerg-services
          rec.radio.amateur.rdf
```

----- Don't Delete Anything Between These Lines -----

REFERENCES

For more information on the newsgroup creation procedures, refer to the article "Guidelines for UseNet Newsgroup Creation" in news.groups, news.announce.newgroups and news.answers. It includes the requirements behind the rules in this CFV including, for example, voting by mail only, the allowed length of the voting period, required margins to pass, prohibition against proxy, forwarded, or conditional votes, etc.

For a complete transcript of the decision-making process that led up to the Request for Discussion and Call for Votes for the rec.radio.amateur reorganization, anonymous FTP to charon.amdahl.com and obtain the files called
/pub/radio/amateur/news.groups-discussion.Z
/pub/radio/amateur/rra-reorg.log.*.Z

The newsgroups on this CFV were the result of the 30-day discussion period that followed the Request for Discussion (which was posted March 25, 1993.)

The rra-reorg mail list was the forum for developing the RFD and for turning the results of the discussion on news.groups into this CFV. The mail list was advertised several times on the rec.radio.amateur.* newsgroups. The following people chose to join and assisted in putting together the proposal:

```
ben@nj8j.atl.ga.us (Ben Coleman NJ8J)
brian@nucleus.amd.com (Brian McMinn N5PSS)
cas30@uts.amdahl.com (Chris Swartout N6WCP)
cdp@hertz.njit.edu (Chris Peckham WG2W)
datwyler@moons.sim.es.com (Doug Datwyler WR70)
ehare@arrl.org (Ed Hare KA1CV)
```

ikluft@uts.amdahl.com (Ian Kluft KD6EUI)
jga@dreaml.wariat.org (Jon Anhold N8USK)
jgt10@uts.amdahl.com (John Thompson KD6KID)
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu (Jay Maynard K5ZC)
mark@ve6mgs.ampr.ab.ca (Mark Salyzyn VE6MGS)
paulf@umunhum.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty N9FZX)
pschleck@cwis.unomaha.edu (Paul W Schleck KD3FU)
root@jackatak.raider.net (Jack GF Hill W4PPT)
steve@matt.ksu.ksu.edu (Steve Schallehn KB0AGD)
steve@wattres.sj.ca.us (Steve Watt KD6GGD)

Date: Mon, 10 May 93 08:25:02 CDT
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!
menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!robert@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: no-code defense
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

> Thank you for the advice, but it's moot as I already did upgrade. As I
> stated before, this is supposed to be a rational debate, but those like
> yourself appear to want to discount the argument as whining so you don't
> need to present a counter argument. Nice try. Listen before your speak.

I not only hold an Amateur Extra Class license, but also a Commercial Radiotelegraph Certificate. Needless to say, I enjoy CW. However, not all amateurs do, and there exists an entry-level ticket for them: the Codeless Technician. I support this license. I think it's a good idea.

The FCC created the Technician license three decades ago "to encourage a greater interest among would-be amateurs in experimentation on and the development of the higher radio frequencies." (from the ARRL License Manual, 59th edition, 1968).

The original Technician license looked very much like the current Codeless Tech, insofar as they had no operator privileges below 30 MHz. The FCC recognized that some amateurs would like to upgrade above that level, and modified the license to allow operation on the Novice portions of 80, 40, 15, and 10 meters. Over the years, I have found (and obviously they agree) that immersion in CW through on-the-air communication is the fastest and most efficient method to increasing speed, and therefore upgrading.

So, today we have six classes of amateur licenses, each with different operator privileges, assigned in accordance with specified band plans. Here are two examples of how these can be misinterpreted: Since I hold an Extra Class, which is an unrestricted license, can I use 'phone on 28.170 MHz (10 meters)? No, since the authorized band plan states that

only digital modes (CW, RTTY, etc.) can be used in that portion. Okay, so if that is so, can a Technician Plus use RTTY on that frequency? Again, no. Although the band plan authorizes this mode, his operator privileges do not (although if he had a General or higher, he could).

If you STILL feel I'm wrong, Todd, I invite you to write a letter to Mr. Ralph A. Haller, who is the Chief of the Private Radio Bureau of the FCC, Washington, DC 20554, and verify these facts, as I have presented them to you.

Have a nice day.

--Robert WA3J

Date: Mon, 10 May 1993 18:57:48 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!
ez006683@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Novice/Tech Data privileges on 10m
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:
[Kevin's stuff deleted]

:
: Read 97.307(f)(10) again. Those are the OPERATOR privileges. Novice and
: Technician class operators may only use A1A (CW) and J3E/R3E (Phone)
: emissions, according to the accepted band plan. In other words, other
: emissions (specifically RTTY) MAY be permitted, but without the correct
: class of license, they're off limits to you. Radioteletype is also
: permitted in the Novice/Tech portions of the 80, 40 and 15 meter bands,
: however those below General are limited to CW only. Check with the FCC.
:
: -Robert WA3J

As you suggested I read it again and was absolutely amazed. I always thought it was CW only for Techs. but I was wrong, and so are you. Look up part 97 Subpart D

97.301:

(e) "For a station having a control operator holding a Technician or Novice Class operator license:" It specifies privs. on 28.1-28.5 and shows no other limitations.

97.305:

(c) 10m 28.0-28.3 RTTY, data see 97.304(f)(4)

97.304(f)(4) defines tech. specs. for allowed RTTY and data transmissions and says nothing about license class required.

97.313(c)(2) Says novice and techs are limited to 200 W PEP on 10 meters, nothing about allowed transmission types.

Now You're Talking 2-7 table 2-1 specifies that RTTY and data are allowed for novices and techs on 10 meters.

I was surprised too.

Dan--

```
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                      Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu             *
*                      Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102            *
*                      Davis CA 95616                          *
*-----*
*      I do not speak for the University of California....    *
*      and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!            *
*-----*
```

Date: Mon, 10 May 93 09:26:25 CDT
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!
menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!robert@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: sick of it all
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

> shift the burden of proof from the plaintiff to the defendant. But it was
> their stance on irrelevant testing at about the same time the FCC was
> further institutionalizing irrelevant tests that I find peculiar. But as
> you said, the government can screw anything up.
>

International Treaty (of which the United States is a signatory) requires knowledge of the International Morse Code for operation below 30 MHz. Again Todd, you should contact the FCC on this one. There is a procedure in place for you, as a citizen, to change the rules. It is called called a "Petition for Rulemaking" and is contained in the Code of Federal Regulations, Title 47. This is available from your local GPO Bookstore, library, or FCC Field Office.

Have a nice day.

--Robert WA3J

Date: Tue, 11 May 1993 00:13:26 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: sick of it all

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

>International Treaty (of which the United States is a signatory) requires
>knowledge of the International Morse Code for operation below 30 MHz.
>Again Todd, you should contact the FCC on this one. There is a procedure
in >place for you, as a citizen, to change the rules. It is called called a
>"Petition for Rulemaking" and is contained in the Code of Federal
>Regulations, Title 47. This is available from your local GPO Bookstore,
>library, or FCC Field Office.

Thank you. I'm aware of the treaty and has been aptly pointed out before,
an administration is free to waive the requirement by notifying the ITU in
writing of their intention to do so. Also I'm aware of the process for
Petition for Rulemaking and will probably submit such a petition. I'm
trying to gauge the support and opposition to various possible petitions.
It is clear that a small vocal minority will oppose any change that
disrupts or detracts from their perceived self-importance. Thank you for
you input. I can assure you I will consider your objections in whatever
petition I put forth. :-)

73,
Todd
N9MWB

Date: Mon, 10 May 93 13:51:29 GMT
From: walter!porthos!dancer!whs70@uunet.uu.net
Subject: What we all agree on - THEORY TESTS THAT MEAN SOMETHING
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1sf64v\$1v3@network.ucsd.edu> jgervais@weber.ucsd.edu (Joe Gervais)
writes:

>
>OK, so ignoring the code/no-code thing, it seems to me that
>the one thing most of us (on both sides) agree on is that the
>written exam is a joke.

>
>So, how about we all abandon the code debate, get together
>and start ranting to the FCC/ARRL/whoever to restructure the
>theory exams? It seems to me to be the one area that would
>guarantee a higher-caliber individual getting the license.
>Sure there'd still be the occassional jerk, but hey, it's
>always better to argue with a smart-ass than a dumb-ass. :-)

>
>Possibilities:

>- Limit amount of fill-in-the-blank questions
> - Problems: Increases work for VECs
> - Benefits: Requires at least a little more brain power

I upgraded to general and then advanced. I saw NO "fill-in-the-blank" questions. All questions were multiple choice. While one can argue for not using multiple choice, the use of multiple choice eliminates any argument as to the correctness of any answer. That isn't always that easy to do with "fill-in-the-blank."

>- Don't publish exams/answers
> - Problems: How do you know you're getting a *real* FCC exam?
> - Benefits: Obvious

The ability to determine the "pool" of questions will (IMHO) never be a problem. Given that tests are not under the direct control of the FCC, even if a new pool of questions was established and that pool of questions wasn't published, it would only be a few months before most questions were identified and published by someone.

>- Require a verbal/written explanation of how a transceiver actually works
> - Problems: Grading could be too subjective
> - Benefits: If you can't at least understand this, you may well not qualify to be a ham in the first place. Explanation doesn't have to be too deep, just cover the basics.

I suggest I can do that in a paragraph or so AND that I can have an 8 year old memorize that answer too.

>(You fill in/critique from here...)

I have an electronics (associate) degree and I spent a fair amount of time reviewing the theory for the advanced test. I suppose I could have memorized all the questions, but that was never something I did well. Bottom line is that there is only one testing process that is not subject to subjective grading and that is the use of multiple choice.

For those that complain about people who memorize the question pool (no small task in my opinion) I go back to when I passed my technician exam (it was the same as the general theory exam in 1960). The study guide for the general contained 14 electronic circuit diagrams and the test usually asked you to draw 3 or 4 of those diagrams. I was in high school at the time and I memorized each of the 14 diagrams. I certainly didn't understand the electronic theory/functionality of most of those diagrams, but I still was able to memorize and pass the test. I suspect many other OF's out there did also, despite the many claims that they HAD TO UNDERSTAND the theory to pass the theory tests when they took it.

Date: (null)
From: (null)
Standard Disclaimer- Any opinions, etc. are mine and NOT my employer's.

Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)
Morristown, NJ email via UUCP bcr!cc!whs70
201-829-2879 Weekdays email via Internet whs70@cc.bellcore.com

Date: Mon, 10 May 93 18:36:40 GMT
From: swrinde!gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!
nnntp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May7.143537.12466@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>,
<1993May7.174540.14265@leland.Stanford.EDU>, <1993May9.130848.4228@ke4zv.uucp>
Subject : Re: More on no-code

In article <1993May9.130848.4228@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
writes:

>That mandated spectrum preserve, rather than the spectral efficiency of CW,
>is what's retarded the decline of CW on HF.

In so arguing, you've just conceded the justification for maintaining both the
requirement and the preserve.

> At VHF and above this spectrum segregation
>has never been an issue and CW is a speciality mode that sees limited
>use.

No, that's because the available spectrum is many times that at HF, so large
in fact that overcrowding has never been a problem, and probably never will
be.

>But it doesn't demonstrate in practice it's theoretical bandwidth
>savings. Most CW contacts still space at least a kilohertz apart, and
>complaints from CW operators are long and loud when any other mode attempts
>to share spectrum with them.

The first argument is not unique to CW, as most SSB operators space themselves
out even further, until the band fills up, at which point, like the CW ops,
they crowd together.

The second argument has been previously dealt with; wideband and narrowband

modes should not share spectrum, as the wides interfere with the narrows but not vice versa.

> Also spectrum is shared by law in the time as well as the frequency domain.
> The higher thruput of other modes can use the spectrum as efficiently, if
> not more so, than manual CW by occupying spectrum for a lesser time for the
> same message content.

While this is true in most services, it isn't true in the Amateur Service. The key here is "message content", and your argument assumes that message length is time independent. While time independence is valid for certain activities within the amateur service (message passing), it is generally invalid, because spectrum occupancy is a function of the operator's free time than of information content (true of ragchewing, contesting, dxing).

> With most CW
> operator's actual speeds hovering around 15 WPM, and with RTTY at 60 WPM,
> AMTOR at about 30 WPM, and HF packet on a good day going 12 WPM, and speech
> at 120 WPM, CW only beats one of the other modes in raw speed for transferring
> information. When you look in terms of WPM/Hz/sec, CW falls toward the
> back of the pack except for a very few exceptional operators under exceptional
> conditions.

Aside from being invalidated by the previous assumption, you're not comparing all three techniques on an information - equal basis. AMTOR, RTTY and SSB all have much higher bit error rates than CW. Unless you apply a fairly low rate code to the former two, the comparison is meaningless.

> I won't be at all surprised to see SS or MSK, coupled with FEC, become the
> dominant method of working moonbounce in the next few years.

SS might get you around the libration fading problem, but you still need to get above the MSK threshold to get to a point where any high rate FEC will help you. Perhaps SS -> PSK -> Low Rate Convolutional Code -> FEC. But of course, one can do this without any access to HF, and in fact, given access to such a system, why is access to HF needed?

--

--Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Just name a hero, and I'll prove he's a bum."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Col. Gregory "Pappy" Boyington, USMC (ret)

Date: 10 May 1993 14:36:22 GMT
From: topaz.bds.com!topaz.bds.com!ron@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1s79esINN3jj@dns1.NMSU.Edu>, <1993May5.144400.16967@hemlock.cray.com>, <1993May10.010936.27854@qualcomm.com>)

Subject : Re: Cellular capable scanners...Buy'em Whil

> As Tsutomu Shimomura demonstrated to the House Subcommittee on
> Telecommunications and Finance the other week, the very best cellular
> "scanner" is an actual cell phone with hacked firmware. He says the
> hardest part is finding the right screwdriver to take off the screws.

Oh great, now we're going to have to have a law banning the manufacture of these screw drivers.

-Ron

Date: Mon, 10 May 1993 12:59:28 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!
gary@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May7.174540.14265@leland.Stanford.EDU>,
<1993May9.130848.4228@ke4zv.uucp>, <C6sM4B.5po@news.Hawaii.Edu>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: More on no-code

In article <C6sM4B.5po@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@uhunix.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeff Herman) writes:

>In article <1993May9.130848.4228@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:

>>

>>CW remains dominant for very weak signal work among amateurs, but the
>>professionals have long discarded it for better methods. Those techniques
>

>You're very wrong, Gary; the professionals have not discarded CW. Please
>tune your general coverage receiver to the maritime frequencies in the
>4, 6, 8, 12, 16, 22, and 25 MHz marine bands (I can provide you with
>the actual frequencies if you'd like). Shipboard and coastal station
>traffic is STILL passed using CW: weather broadcasts, distress traffic,
>navigation warnings, periodic position reports, all go CW; every 6 hours,
>every ship in the world sends it observed weather to a shore station
>via CW.

The professionals I was refering to do considerably weaker signal work than that. I was talking about the NASA Deep Space Network. But on the subject of marine CW, the following should be of interest.

U.S. COAST GUARD TO DISCONTINUE WATCHKEEPING ON THE DISTRESS
FREQUENCY 500 KHZ AND CEASE ALL MORSE CODE SERVICES

Effective August 1, 1993, all United States Coast Guard Communication Stations and Cutters will discontinue watchkeeping on the distress frequency 500 KHZ, and will cease all morse code services in the medium frequency radiotelegraphy band. More efficient telecommunication systems are now available to provide the mariner with options for initiating or relaying distress alerts, and passing and receiving maritime safety information. These options include INMARSAT, Radio Telex (SITOR), MF/HF single sideband and VHF radiotelephone, and satellite EPIRBS (for distress alerts and telecommunications), and INMARSAT SAFETYNET, Navtex Broadcasts include the same notices to mariners, weather, search and rescue and fixed fishing gear location products that have been provided by the MF morse broadcasts. Distress and other calls to any U.S. Coast Guard Communication Station can also be made on any of the following HF single sideband radiotelephone channels: 424 (4134 KHZ), 601 (6200 KHZ), 816 (8240 KHZ), or 1205 (12242 KHZ). Meteorological broadcasts are also made over these channels. We believe these options provide sufficient redundancy to ensure that adequate distress and safety coverage. Any comments regarding this discontinuance of MF morse telegraphy services can be sent to any Coast Guard Communications Station or direct to U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters:

Commandant (G-TTM)
U.S. Coast Guard
Washington, DC 20593
Telex: 892427 (COASTGUARDWSH)
Telefax: (202) 267-4106 or 267-4662

That should answer the question of marine Morse.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Sun, 09 May 1993 02:55:15 GMT
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1hz@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May5.093748.19256@ke4zv.uucp>,

<930506.203411.1N2.rusnews.w165w@mooch.sbs.com>, <1993May8.165932.1305@ke4zv.uucp>
Subject : Re: no-code defense

gary@ke4zv.uucp (Gary Coffman) writes:

>Now certain League officials may be venial, but even so it's hard to
>see how they would personally profit much from greater membership
>in the association. Certainly the salaries of the paid staff don't
>reflect prosperity, and the elected officials aren't paid, except
>for per diem expenses.

...

>Accusing them of being in it for the money is wide of the mark.

I assume the League is a non-profit organization. As such, having worked
with many non-profit organizations, the one thing they are always looking
for is a source of new funds.

To say that the ARRL doesn't look at the no-code license as a money
making opportunity is wide of the mark.

MD

--

-- Michael P. Deignan, KD1HZ	/	Since I *OWN* SBS.COM,
-- Domain: kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.risc.net	/	these opinions generally
-- UUCP: ...!uunet!anomaly!kd1hz	/	reflect those of my
-- Telebit: +1 401 455 0347	/	company...

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #136
